	Case 1:20-cv-01804-DAD-EPG Docume	nt 19 Filed 04/08/21 Page 1 of 3
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11		
12	JOSHUA WILLARD,	Case No. 1:20-cv-01804-NONE-EPG (PC)
13	Plaintiff,	
14	v.	ORDER SETTING SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE
15	A. ARANDA, et al.,	CONTENENCE
16	Defendants.	
17		
18	Joshua Willard ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in	
19	this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The court has determined that this case will	
20	benefit from a settlement conference. Therefore, this case will be referred to Magistrate Judge	
21	Kendall J. Newman to conduct a settlement conference on May 24, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. The	
22	settlement conference will be conducted by remote means, to be determined at a later date and	
23	time. The Court will issue the necessary transportation order in due course.	
24	In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:	
25	1. This case is set for a settlement conference before Magistrate Judge Kendall J.	
26	Newman on May 24, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. The settlement conference will be conducted	
27	by remote means, to be determined at a later date and time.	
28	2. A representative with full and unlin	mited authority to negotiate and enter into a binding

Case 1:20-cv-01804-DAD-EPG Document 19 Filed 04/08/21 Page 2 of 3

settlement on the defendants' behalf shall attend in person.¹

- 3. Those in attendance must be prepared to discuss the claims, defenses and damages.
 The failure of any counsel, party or authorized person subject to this order to appear in person may result in the imposition of sanctions. In addition, the conference will not proceed and will be reset to another date.
- 4. The parties are directed to exchange non-confidential settlement statements seven days prior to the settlement conference. These statements shall simultaneously be delivered to the court using the following email address: <a href="kipotentials.com/kipotentia

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **April 7, 2021**

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE HIDGE

¹ While the exercise of its authority is subject to abuse of discretion review, "the district court has the authority to order parties, including the federal government, to participate in mandatory settlement conferences...." <u>United States v. United States District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands</u>, 694 F.3d 1051, 1053, 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2012)("the district court has broad authority to compel participation in mandatory settlement conference[s]."). The term "full authority to settle" means that the individuals attending the mediation conference must be authorized to fully explore settlement options and to agree at that time to any settlement terms acceptable to the parties. <u>G. Heileman Brewing Co.</u>, Inc. v. Joseph Oat Corp., 871 F.2d 648, 653 (7th Cir. 1989), <u>cited with approval in Official Airline Guides, Inc. v. Goss</u>, 6 F.3d 1385, 1396 (9th Cir. 1993). The individual with full authority to settle must also have "unfettered discretion and authority" to change the settlement position of the party, if appropriate. <u>Pitman v. Brinker Int'l., Inc.</u>, 216 F.R.D. 481, 485-86 (D. Ariz. 2003), <u>amended on recon. in part, Pitman v. Brinker Int'l., Inc.</u>, 2003 WL 23353478 (D. Ariz. 2003). The purpose behind requiring the attendance of a person with full settlement authority is that the parties' view of the case may be altered during the face to face conference. <u>Pitman</u>, 216 F.R.D. at 486. An authorization to settle for a limited dollar amount or sum certain can be found not to comply with the requirement of full authority to settle. <u>Nick v. Morgan's Foods, Inc.</u>, 270 F.3d 590, 596-97 (8th Cir. 2001).

Case 1:20-cv-01804-DAD-EPG Document 19 Filed 04/08/21 Page 3 of 3